

## REMARKS

Claims 1 and 4-7 are pending in the application. In the Office Action, the Examiner has maintained the rejection of all of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,237,482 to Osterhout et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,406,033 to Pazdirek.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because there is insufficient motivation to combine the Osterhout patent with the Pazdirek patent. The Osterhout patent discloses a mounting bracket 21 for mounting an arrester 1. The Pazdirek patent relates to a suspension insulator that suspends a transmission line from an overhead support and it discloses a fiberglass rod 24 enclosed within a polymeric cover 30. The Examiner maintains that it would have been obvious to modify the Osterhout patent to use the fiberglass rod taught by the Pazdirek patent.


The two patents, however, relate to different types of insulators. The Pazdirek patent discloses a suspension insulator. The suspension insulator suspends wires from an overhead mounting bracket. Consequently, the primary requirement for a suspension insulator is high tensile strength. The Pazdirek patent recognizes this, and explains that “the tensile strength of the rod is imparted primarily by the fibers in the strand 22.” On the other hand, the mounting bracket of the Osterhout patent is mounted in a cantilever configuration. The bracket therefore requires a high flexural strength, rather than tensile strength.

The Examiner maintains that it would have been obvious to add the fiberglass rod of the Pazdirek patent to the bracket of the Osterhout patent to “augment the mechanical properties of the Osterhout patent and to enhance the resilience of the bracket to stressing forces.” The Examiner’s contention, however, improperly ignores the different requirements of the two devices: one requires high tensile strength while the other requires high flexural strength. Nothing suggests using the high tensile strength fiberglass rod of the Pazdirek patent to improve

the flexural strength of the bracket of the Osterhout patent. Consequently, there is no motivation to combine the two references. Because there is no motivation to combine the two references, the rejection is improper. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants believe that claims 1 and 4-7 are allowable over the prior art of record. Prompt and favorable reexamination and reconsideration of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Michael E. Stimson  
Reg. No. 41,333

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.  
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 659-9076

Dated: June 21 2004